

inclined "to stand by the flag as soldiers." From this group of 63 has developed the current organization of over 100,000 members.

The Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. is proud of the history of its individual members in all of America's wars and conflicts. It is also proud of its own history as an organization. All of us share in that pride for it is well-earned. JWV led the effort to end the pogroms against Eastern European Jews at the beginning of this century. They led the national boycott of German goods in the 1930's. And they have supported the state of Israel since its birth in 1948. Moreover, the JWV actively supported the civil rights movement of the 1960's and was the only veterans group to support the 1963 march on Washington. It also was the first group to call for the withdrawal of United States military forces from Vietnam in 1971.

The JWV's 100-year history has kept it in the forefront of groups which support America's military personnel and our veterans. It has supported educational, veterans, and community projects and has done so regardless of religion, race, or gender.

America is proud of all its veterans. Today, we should stop and pay tribute to this outstanding veterans organization. America congratulates the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. on its centennial anniversary.●

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, on February 8, the President signed into law the Telecommunications Act of 1996. This act has been my highest legislative priority for the 104th Congress. I am very pleased with the great strides we are making in deregulating and fostering competition in this critical field. But our work is not over. I ask to have printed in the RECORD the article I wrote for Roll Call detailing what lies ahead for telecommunications reform.

The article follows:

[From Roll Call, Mar. 11, 1996]

TELECOM REFORM: IT AIN'T OVER 'TIL IT'S OVER

(By Senator Larry Pressler)

Historic. Massive. Landmark. Sweeping. Adjectives such as these were often used by journalists and lobbyists alike to describe the recently passed Telecommunications Act of 1996. So often, in fact, I think that some began to wonder if we had placed them in the bill's formal title.

The truth is such adjectives got a lot of ink because they captured the scope and direction of the bill. As well they should. Congress had been so long about the business of updating the nation's antiquated communications laws that, when we were finally able to get a bill moving, it had no choice but to be "historic, massive, and sweeping" if we were to have any chance of keeping up with the pace of technological development.

Passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 was my highest legislative priority in the first session of the 104th Congress. On Feb. 8, that priority became law.

Thanks to my bill, the communications industry will see an explosion in new invest-

ment and development. Who are the winners? The consumers. There will be more services and new products at lower costs. All of this economic activity will mean new jobs.

Competition is the key for this development. My bill unlocked the regulatory handcuffs restricting the communications industry—now, competition will bring everything from lower costs and new products to better education opportunities to the public.

But we are not done. Passage of the act does not mean Congress can now wait another 62 years before looking at telecommunications issues again.

On the contrary, we must regard telecommunications reform as a work in progress. Although our legislative calendar may be somewhat attenuated this election year, the list of telecommunications priorities facing the second session of the 104th Congress is as impressive as it is imperative.

Among the priorities for the Commerce Committee this year are ensuring that the Federal Communications Commission carries out Congress's intent when it sets the rules to implement the Telecommunications Act; determining federal use and allocation of the full spectrum; and re-examining the rule barring foreign investment in US telecommunications firms.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OVERSIGHT

First and foremost, Congress needs to make sure that what the American consumer won on the legislative battlefield isn't lost on the regulatory drawing board. In other words, we need to make sure that the FCC carries out the intent of Congress as it implements the tenets of the Telecommunications Act.

This is no small task. Nor is it frivolous. There were many hard-fought battles by various segments of the industry during the drafting of the Telecommunications Act. Now that the scene shifts from the legislative to the regulatory venue, the temptation to refight lost battles beckons many an interest group.

Congress must be vigilant and hold fast against the possibility of regulatory revisionism as the FCC proceeds with its rule-making processes.

The battle flags already are flying. For instance, the FCC, in initiating a rule-making intended to accelerate the ability of Regional Bell Operating Companies (RBOCs) to offer long-distance service outside their monopoly operating areas, is proposing to require the RBOCs to set up separate subsidiaries to provide such services.

As I pointed out in a recent letter to FCC Chairman Reed Hundt, this is totally contrary to provisions in the Telecommunications Act that specifically exempt the RBOCs from having to provide out-of-region, long-distance services under a separate subsidiary.

In another potential regulatory overreach, the FCC is considering requiring broadcasters to increase the amount of air time dedicated to public interest programming, as well as possibly requiring more children's programming. Such government-mandated content control would be enforced through the station license renewal process.

The issue here is not whether more children's and public interest programming is desirable, but whether these goals should be mandated by the FCC as part of the broadcast license renewal process.

In fact, Congress was quite clear about its intentions in the license renewal provisions of the Telecommunications Act. The act requires license simplification, not license complication. The FCC's direction in carrying out this provision seems to be headed in the direction of re-regulation instead of deregulation. It is the latter approach Congress clearly intended.

As to the issue of program content, I think the best public policy is to keep the government's involvement to a minimum and let the industry and the public determine the content of programming. I support providing parents with the necessary technological weapons, such as the "V-chip," to help them control what their children see on television. Of course, the ultimate "V-chip" already exists on every television set in America—the on/off switch.

Currently, a plethora of flexible, quickly evolving, and market-driven parental blocking technologies are available. Some are already incorporated into many televisions and VCR's. Other are sold as separate add-on devices. We must be mindful that government does not dry up the market for such devices by mandating one technology over all others.

FCC REFORM

Another major focus for the committee this year will be to examine the overall performance and needs of the FCC as it carries out its duties. We will look closely at the agency's repeated requests for additional money to implement the Telecommunications Act.

As I have told Chairman Hundt, I am concerned about the FCC's alarms over possible budget shortfalls and calls for more personnel and other resources to carry out its mission.

The FCC has requested a budget of approximately \$224 million for fiscal 1996, supporting some 2,300 employees. This is roughly two-thirds more than the FCC's budget in 1993 (\$134 million) and includes an additional 600 employees over the 1993 staffing level (1,700).

In fact, since 1992, FCC expenditures have risen at a compounded average annual rate of 15.2 percent, compared with an average of 10.4 percent for the communications industry itself.

Should the growth of a federal agency outstrip the very industry it regulates by a margin of three to two? No. Particularly in an era of federal budget austerity in which the watchwords for most other federal agencies are "smaller but smarter" government.

Clearly, Congress will have to look closely at the FCC during this second session and see what efficiencies can be realized in its operations.

OVERVIEW OF FEDERAL SPECTRUM POLICIES

Another major task facing Congress this year is a thorough examination of federal policies regarding the use and allocation of the electromagnetic spectrum. The electromagnetic spectrum, generally defined as the range of electromagnetic frequencies between three kilohertz and 300 gigahertz, is one of the nation's most valuable resources.

I believe the federal government has a responsibility to ensure that the efficient management of this resource provides adequately for the national defense, the protection of the taxpayer, and the continued maintenance of America's technological leadership.

The full committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is planning to hold hearings on this complex subject, beginning in March.

During these hearings, we will examine the government's management and allocation of the entire spectrum, not just that small portion of it used for radio and television broadcasting. This includes supporting: civilian emergency services; scientific and satellite uses; merchant marine emergency and navigation uses; aviation uses; truck and railroad uses; cellular phone and personal communications services; military and intelligence uses; and specialized data-transmission uses, such as telemedicine services.

Much of the focus of this spectrum review naturally will gravitate toward the issue of

digital television and how portions of the finite spectrum should be allocated to broadcasters for the development of digital transmission.

I have long been a supporter of protecting the taxpayers in allocations of the spectrum by the FCC. In fact, I proposed an auction earlier in the year as part of the budget reconciliation process.

While I believe the Telecommunications Act of 1996 was clear in that it did not mandate any giveaway of the digital spectrum, it is important that Congress revisit this issue this year and establish a clear national policy on spectrum assignments to the private sector.

OTHER ISSUES

There are a number of other telecommunications issues that will occupy the committee's attention this year, including a look at whether current rules restricting foreign investment in US broadcasting are good for the nation.

It may well be that we should allow more foreign investment in US broadcasting, provided US broadcasters have the same investment rights overseas. This could open more foreign markets to US telecommunications products and services. The committee may hold hearings this year on this issue.

The committee also will consider reforming the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. When that act was passed, no one thought private companies would launch and operate satellites. Today, we have private companies competing with the international government-owned satellite systems, INTELSAT and INMARSAT. We need to re-evaluate how competition should operate in the international satellite market.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 was a major legislative step forward in modernizing America's ancient telecommunications laws. But we cannot rest on our legislative laurels if Congress is to provide a regulatory infrastructure that helps, rather than hinders, America's telecommunications industry. Our work has just begun. •

TRIBUTE TO THE CREW OF SPECIAL AIR MISSION 3311 TO HAITI IN SEPTEMBER 1994

• Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the outstanding service of the crew of Special Air Mission 3311, which transported former President Jimmy Carter, retired U.S. Army Gen. Colin Powell, and myself to and from Haiti in September 1994. This mission was a last chance attempt to achieve a peaceful return to power of Haiti's democratically elected government. Although the successful outcome of the United States negotiating effort is well known, I want to reflect for a moment on the bravery and high level of professionalism exhibited by the air crew that gave our mission of peace the opportunity it needed to succeed.

Recently, I had the opportunity to speak with one of the members of this aircrew and I recalled the extraordinarily difficult conditions under which the aircrew members were forced to operate. On the evening of September 16, 1994, this aircrew was given less than 8 hours to prepare for a 6 a.m. departure for the following day in which neither the destination, nor the passengers of the flight, were known. Only 3 hours before the flight's scheduled departure did the aircrew learn of its or-

ders to transport General Powell from Andrews Air Force Base to Robins Air Force Base in Georgia, where they would pick up former President Carter and myself, and continue its flight to Port-au-Prince, Haiti. Intelligence sources at that time indicated that the runway at the Port-au-Prince airport was unusable. There were large amounts of debris littering the runway, including nails and 8-foot-high metal containers. Only minutes prior to the landing, as much debris as possible was moved to the sides of the runway. Miraculously, and with no margin for error, the crew was able to land the aircraft with only 20 feet of wing-tip clearance. However, the crew's ordeal did not end at that point in the mission.

On September 18, the aircraft returned for our mission's departure from Haiti. Delays in our negotiations resulted in the crew having to wait for more than ten hours in the plane for the return of our delegation. The crew members endured heat in excess of 120 degrees while maintaining the aircraft's readiness for an instant departure with minimal support facilities. The crew had to function under the additional stress of knowing that the negotiations were not proceeding very well. When our negotiating team arrived at the aircraft for departure, the crew had no knowledge concerning the final outcome of our discussions or the current status of a United States invasion force that was enroute from Pope Air Force Base to Haiti. Only after a successful takeoff under these tense conditions did the crew learn that the negotiations had concluded successfully.

Mr. President, the courage, dedication, and professionalism of the aircrew of Special Air Mission 3311 to Haiti represent the finest qualities of the men and women serving in our Nation's Armed Forces. For their dedication, each member of the aircrew was awarded the Air Medal. In addition, this extraordinary unit received the 21st Air Force Aircrew Excellence Award for the third quarter 1994 and was nominated for the Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner Award for Outstanding Air Mobility Command Aircrew. They made a major contribution to our mission to Haiti. Today, I want to pay tribute to the excellent job that they performed and I ask that a list of the names of those outstanding individuals who served in Special Air Mission 3311 be printed in the RECORD.

The list follows:

THE CREW OF SPECIAL AIR MISSION 3311

Major Loail M. Sims, Jr.
Lieutenant Colonel William F. Dea
Captain Peter M. Lenio
Major David B. Ingersoll
Captain Steven A. Burgess
Master Sergeant Mark L. Buchner
Staff Sergeant Kenneth K. McNamara
Master Sergeant David A. Nelson
Staff Sergeant Kimberly M. Herd
Master Sergeant Brian D. Smith
Master Sergeant Karen G. Kron
Staff Sergeant Sheila L. Bradley

Staff Sergeant Darryl O. Walizer
Staff Sergeant Lennard C. Edwards
Master Sergeant John M. Piva
Staff Sergeant John C. Bergquist
Staff Sergeant John Bresnahan
Technical Sergeant Victor N. Gobe'r
Technical Sergeant Roy L. Tatum. •

CBO ANALYSIS OF UNFUNDED MANDATES

• Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, pursuant to Public Law 104-4, I am submitting for the information of the Senate a CBO analysis of unfunded mandates of bills reported by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee currently on the Senate Calendar. As further information is available, it will also be provided to the Senate.

The analysis follows:

BILLS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN MANDATES

S. 115 Colonial National Historical Park Amendments.

S. 127 Women's Rights National Historical Park Amendments.

S. 134 Franklin D. Roosevelt Family Lands.

S. 188 Great Falls Preservation and Redevelopment Act.

S. 197 Carl Garner Federal Lands Cleanup Day.

S. 223 Sterling Forest Protection Act of 1995.

S. 225 FERC Voluntary Licensing of Hydroelectric Projects on Fresh Waters in the State of Hawaii.

S. 283 A bill to extend the deadlines under the Federal Power Act for two hydroelectric projects in Pennsylvania.

S. 333 Department of Energy Risk Management Act of 1995.

S. 342 Cache La Poudre River National Water Heritage Area Act of 1995.

S. 357 Na Hoa Pili Kaloko-Honokohau Re-establishment Act of 1995.

S. 359 Extension of construction deadline for certain hydroelectric projects located in the State of West Virginia.

S. 378 Columbia Basin Land Exchange.

S. 392 Dayton Aviation Heritage Commis-

sion.

S. 421 Extension of construction deadline for a hydroelectric project located in the State of Kentucky.

S. 461 Extension of construction deadline for a hydroelectric project located in the State of Washington.

S. 468 A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for the construction of a hydroelectric project in Ohio.

S. 509 A bill to allow the town of Grand Lake, Colorado to maintain permanently a cemetery in the Rocky Mountain National Park.

S. 522 Limited exemption to licensing provisions for facilities associated with the El Vado Hydroelectric Project, New Mexico.

S. 538 Extension of construction deadline for a hydroelectric project located in the State of Oregon.

S. 543 A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for the construction of a hydroelectric project in Oregon.

S. 547 A bill to extend the deadlines applicable to certain hydroelectric projects under the Federal Power Act.

S. 549 Extension of construction deadline for certain hydroelectric projects located in the State of Arkansas.

S. 551 Idaho National Monument Boundary Revision Act of 1995.

S. 552 Hydroelectric Facility in Montana.

S. 595 Extension of a hydroelectric project located in the State of West Virginia.